INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION SECTOR

STUDY PERIOD 2009-2012

COM 15 – LS 301 – E

English only

Original: English

Question(s): 10/15

LIAISON STATEMENT

Source: ITU-T Study Group 15

Title: Last Call review of draft-ietf-mpls-tp-on-demand-cv-03 [ref #053.02]

LIAISON STATEMENT

For action to: IETF MPLS WG

For comment to: -

For information to: -

Approval: Agreed to by Question 10/15 (by correspondence)

Deadline: 1 June 2011

Contact: Huub van Helvoort
Huawei Technologies Ltd.
P.R. China
Tel : +31 649248936
Email : huub.van.helvoort@huawei.com

This liaison is in response to the Working Group Last Call on draft-ietf-mpls-tp-on-demand-cv-03.

Please note that the ITU-T is required to respond to a WG last call.

The experts of Q10/15 have comments on draft-ietf-mpls-tp-on-demand-cv-03 as provided in the Annex.

The experts of Q10/15 request that their comments are resolved before the IETF approves the draft.

Annex

#	Comment	Proposed resolution
1	The term “CV” for this mechanism is confusing because we have another I-D “cc-cv-rdi”. On demand CV is not the extension of CC/CV functions, but the extension of LSP-Ping. This is an emulation of LBM/LBR.	We suggest not to call this function “On-demand CV” and not to use the term “CV” in this draft. The definitions of CC/CV/RDI/Pro-active CV/On-demand could be added to the rosetta-stone draft.
2	Need to clarify the scope: Is this mechanism applicable only to LSPs (thus updating only RFC4379) or also to PWs (thus updating also RFC5085)?	If applicable only to LPS, add clarification
3	Section 1.2 and 1.3: It is not clear why this draft mentions BFD and RFC5884 (BFD for MPLS LSPs).	
4	Section 2.2.1: The reference to draft-ietf-mpls-tp-identifiers is normative and not informative as reported in section 9.2	Update reference.
5	Section 2.2.2 and 2.2.3: LSP Ping is extended to be used in non-IP networks by defining: - DSMAP/DDMAP Based Non-IP Address TLV, - Source/Destination Address TLV. However, In transport networks, in-band OAM functions do not need addresses, just identifiers.	Remove address TLVs.
6	Section 2: It is also not clear how these address TLVs are used for MEP-to-MEP and MEP-to-MIP communication. And it is also not clear how they are used in case of node MEP/MIP and/or per interface MEP/MIP.	Clarify the identification of nodes and interfaces for the different scenarios if the address TLVs are used.
7	It seems that this draft (version 03) has determined not to use ACH-TLV as defined in RFC5586 since the draft ach-tlv is removed. The rational is that RFC4379 also has TLV in its payload so that users may be confused whether the new TLVs in this draft are applied according to ach-tlv or RFC4379 TLV.	To have consistency with RFC5586 where the Ach-TLV is optionally defined, it is requested to have the clear description of not using ach-tlv in this draft.
8	Section 2.3: OAM mechanisms should work with MEG, MEP and MIP identifiers. These identifiers should not be dependent on how the LSP or PW has been setup (e.g., statically or via a dynamic control plane).	
9	Ingress/Egress (node) should be aligned with requesting/replying node. It seems “Ingress” is “requesting”, but we have 2 LSPs for this function (Therefore may be confused)	Clarify the relation between Ingress/Egress and requesting/replying nodes.

10	Section 3.3: How can a node receive an echo request with reply mode different than 4 if the echo requests MUST be sent with a reply mode equal to 4?	
11	Section 3.4: More clarification is required on “Reverse Path Connectivity Verification” such as:	
	a) Are “reverse path FEC information” in 3.4.1 (that refers to 3.4.2) and “Reverse-path target FEC stack TLV” in 3.4.2 the same? The former is described to “(SHOULD) return” while the latter is described to “(MAY) attach”.	
	b) Figure 8 is unclear regarding the text in 3.2 Target FEC Stack in RFC4379 since the length and value fields (prefix) are missing.	
	c) Regarding check #1 in 3.4.3: is it the same as 3.6 in RFC4379 where “The Interface and Label Stack TLV MAY be validated”. (Or does the Interface in this draft refer to the physical IF or the server layer?)	
	d) In 3.4.3, it says “2. If the Reverse-Path target FEC stack stack TLV is present…” *(Besides duplicated “stack” (typo)).* How does the Ingress (requesting) node acknowledge/expect that this TLV as attached in replying is included?	Clarification of the validation is required.
12	Section 3.5 and 4.3: The reference to draft-ietf-p2mp-lsp-ping is normative and not informative as reported in section 9.2	Update reference.
13	Section 3.5 and 4.3: The procedures in section 3.3 assume the existence of an in-band return path. How can they be used with p2mp LSPs that do not have an in-band return path?	Update reference.